

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-21, and 23-37 are currently pending. Claims 5 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice; and Claims 1, 11, 13, 18, 30, and 35 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to regarding various informalities; Claim 11 was objected to as containing a misspelling; Claims 12, 13, 14, 29, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite regarding the term “portion”; Claims 1, 12, 13, 18, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,661,986 to Kitayama (hereinafter “the ‘986 patent”); Claims 1, 2, and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,473,417 to Essl (hereinafter “the ‘417 patent”); Claims 1, 3, 4, 16-18, 20, 21, and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,985,432 to Hou et al. (hereinafter “the ‘432 patent”); Claims 1, 15, 18, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,210,574 to Kita (hereinafter “the ‘574 patent”); Claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 11, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,907,205 to Himes et al. (hereinafter “the ‘205 patent”); and Claims 19, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘574 patent in view of the ‘417 patent.

Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the specification is rendered moot by the present amendment to the specification. The specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action and to clarify the noted paragraphs. Accordingly, the objection to the specification is believed to have been overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 11 is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 11. Claim 11 has been amended to correct the noted misspelling. Accordingly, the objection to Claim 11 is believed to have been overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 12-14 and 29-31 are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 13 and 30. Claims 13 and 30 have been amended to depend from Claims 1 and 18 respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejections of Claims 12-14 and 29-31 are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 13 and 30.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a transmission, comprising: (1) a rotary shaft; (2) a transmissive member coupled with the rotary shaft and secured to the rotary shaft, the transmissive member having a first end and a second end; and (3) a regulative member secured to the rotary shaft by press fitting, wherein the regulative member press-contacts the first end of the transmissive member in such a manner that the transmissive member is always perpendicular to the rotary shaft. Further, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation recited in original Claim 5, i.e., that at least three portions in the circumferential direction on the regulative member are protruded outward in the circumferential direction from the regulative member relative to other portions, the protruded portions having surfaces opposing to the first end of the transmissive member, each of the surfaces being formed as a regulative surface that press-contacts the first end of the transmissive member. Accordingly, the changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the separate rejections of Claim 1 as anticipated by the '986, '417, '432, '574, and '205 patents are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1. Moreover, Applicants note that none of the '986, '417, '432, and '574 patents was asserted as teaching the limitations recited in Claim 5. However, since the '205 patent was

asserted in a rejection of Claim 5, Applicants will address the teachings of the ‘205 patent respect to amended Claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘986, ‘417, ‘432, and ‘574 patents each fail to disclose at least three portions in the circumferential direction on the regulative member are protruded outward in the circumferential direction from the regulative member relative to other portions, wherein each of the surfaces is formed as a regulative surface that press-contacts the first end of the transmissive member, as recited in amended Claim 1.

The ‘205 patent is directed to a coupling arrangement having an optical photo-conductive drum including a drum exterior and interior surfaces surrounding and extending along a longitudinal axis. Further, the ‘205 patent discloses that the coupling arrangement includes a flange having a flange interior surface disposed in a first open end and a flange exterior surface disposed outside of the first open end. As shown in Figure 1, the ‘205 patent discloses that the coupling arrangement also includes a grounding plate 40 that includes one or more outwardly extending contacts 41 to achieve electrical connection with one or more contact areas 16 of the OPC drum 10, as well as one or more inwardly extending contacts 42 that achieve electrical connection with the grounding shaft 30. See Figure 4 of the ‘205 patent, which shows the contacts 16 and 36 as well as the grounding plate 40. Further, the ‘205 patent discloses that the grounding plate 40 can also include a variety of materials that can achieve the desired electrical connection, such as metals or metal coating such as copper, iron, aluminum and/or phosphorous bronze.¹ Further, the ‘205 patent discloses that “by the above arrangement, grounding of the OPC drum 10 (i.e., grounding of the grounding plate 40 with the drum interior surface 12 of the OPC drum 10, and grounding of the grounding plate 40 with the grounding shaft 30) can be achieved.”² However, Applicants respectfully submit

¹ ‘205 patent, column 9, lines 32-36.

² ‘205 patent, column 9, lines 37-41.

that the ‘205 patent fails to disclose at least three portions in the circumferential direction on the regulative member protruded outward in the circumferential direction from the regulative member relative to other portions, the protruded portions having surfaces opposing to the first end of a transmissive member, each of the surfaces formed as a regulative surface that press-contacts the first end of the transmissive member, in such a manner that the transmissive member is always perpendicular to the rotary shaft, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘205 patent merely discloses a grounding plate having outwardly extending contacts 41 that achieve electrical connection with one or more contact areas 16 of an OPC drum 10. The grounding plate 40 disclosed by the ‘205 patent appears to have nothing to do with press-contacting a first transmissive member in such a manner that the transmissive member is always perpendicular to the rotary shaft, wherein this is accomplished by having at least three portions on the regulative member protruded outward in a circumferential direction and having the surfaces press-contact the first end of the transmissive member, as recited in amended Claim 1. Rather, the grounding plate 40 appears merely to provide an electrical connection between the OPC drum 10 and the grounding shaft 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 patentably defines over the ‘205 patent.

Independent Claims 18 and 35 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 18 and 25 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendments to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 18 and 35 as anticipated by each of the ‘986, ‘417, ‘432, ‘574, and ‘205 patents is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 18 and 35.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 19, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103,
Applicants respectfully submit that those rejections are rendered moot by the present
amendment to Claim 18.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 18, and 35 (and all
associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '986,
'417, '432, '574, and '205 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion,
the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as
amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and
favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

GJM:KMB\dt
I:\ATTY\KMB\241986US-AM.DOC